



Board of Commissioners of Cook County

118 North Clark Street
Chicago, IL

Legislation Details (With Text)

File #:	24-2938	Version:	1	Name:	PROPOSED TRANSFER OF FUNDS
Type:	Transfer of Funds	Status:		Status:	Approved
File created:	4/26/2024	In control:		In control:	Board of Commissioners
On agenda:	5/16/2024	Final action:		Final action:	5/16/2024
Title:	PROPOSED TRANSFER OF FUNDS				

Department: Office of the Chief Judge, Circuit Court of Cook County

Request: To approve a transfer of funds between accounts within the Office of the Chief Judge.

Reason: A transfer of funds is necessary to reconcile deficits with certain operating accounts as a result of cost increases and the payment of expenses that were unplanned for FY2024.

From Account(s):

11100.1310.35095.501010 (\$100,000)
11100.1440.10155.520830 (\$400,000)
11100.1440.35495.501010 (\$515,200)
11285.1310.16195.520830 (\$300,000)

To Account(s):

11100.1310.15345.520209 (\$100,000)
11100.1440.35225.530010 (\$400,000)
11100.1440.10155.540135 (\$515,200)
11285.1310.16195.501010 (\$295,712)
11285.1310.16195.501511 (\$4,288)

Total Amount of Transfer: \$1,315,200.00

On what date did it become apparent that the receiving account would require an infusion of funds in order to meet current obligations? What was the balance in the account on that date, and what was the balance 30 days prior to that date?

In April 2024, the Office of the Chief Judge conducted a budget analysis which reflected negative variances that exist or are anticipated to exist within certain budgeted accounts. These findings prompted a budget transfer request to avoid funding failures and exceptions.

How was the account used for the source of transferred funds identified? List any other accounts that were also considered (but not used) as the source of the transferred funds.

For the source of the budget transfer, the Office of the Chief Judge proposes to use funds from Personnel, and Professional Services, accounts to cover the negative variances within the Food Services and Food Supply accounts and Working Capital account. OCJ also proposes to transfer funds from F11285 Professional Services account to accommodate paying for positions that were only partially funded with an ARPA allocation, and which positions will be filled before the end of FY24. The Office of the Chief Judge also seeks a transfer from the Juvenile Detention Center's Personnel account to cover the costs of a security scanner that was installed after the end of FY23.

Identify any projects, purchases, programs, contracts, or other obligations that will be deferred, delayed, or canceled as a result of the reduction in available spending authority that will result in the account that funds are transferred from.

None.

If the answer to the above question is "none" then please explain why this account was originally budgeted in a manner that caused an unobligated surplus to develop at this point in the fiscal year.

Cost of food increases due to inflation, and return to full activity post-COVID for juror services. JTDC scanner was to be paid for in FY23, however, it was not installed until after the end of FY 23, and after the FY 24 budget had been adopted.

Sponsors:

Indexes: (Inactive) TIMOTHY C. EVANS, Chief Judge, Circuit Court of Cook County

Code sections:

Attachments:

Date	Ver.	Action By	Action	Result
5/16/2024	1	Board of Commissioners	approve	Pass

PROPOSED TRANSFER OF FUNDS

Department: Office of the Chief Judge, Circuit Court of Cook County

Request: To approve a transfer of funds between accounts within the Office of the Chief Judge.

Reason: A transfer of funds is necessary to reconcile deficits with certain operating accounts as a result of cost increases and the payment of expenses that were unplanned for FY2024.

From Account(s):

- 11100.1310.35095.501010 (\$100,000)
- 11100.1440.10155.520830 (\$400,000)
- 11100.1440.35495.501010 (\$515,200)
- 11285.1310.16195.520830 (\$300,000)

To Account(s):

- 11100.1310.15345.520209 (\$100,000)
- 11100.1440.35225.530010 (\$400,000)
- 11100.1440.10155.540135 (\$515,200)
- 11285.1310.16195.501010 (\$295,712)
- 11285.1310.16195.501511 (\$4,288)

Total Amount of Transfer: \$1,315,200.00

On what date did it become apparent that the receiving account would require an infusion of funds in order to meet current obligations? What was the balance in the account on that date, and what was the balance 30 days prior to that date?

In April 2024, the Office of the Chief Judge conducted a budget analysis which reflected negative variances that exist or are anticipated to exist within certain budgeted accounts. These findings prompted a budget transfer request to avoid funding failures and exceptions.

How was the account used for the source of transferred funds identified? List any other accounts that were also considered (but not used) as the source of the transferred funds.

For the source of the budget transfer, the Office of the Chief Judge proposes to use funds from Personnel, and Professional Services, accounts to cover the negative variances within the Food Services and Food Supply accounts and Working Capital account. OCJ also proposes to transfer funds from F11285 Professional Services account to accommodate paying for positions that were only partially funded with an ARPA allocation, and which positions will be filled before the end of FY24. The Office of the Chief Judge also seeks a transfer from the Juvenile Detention Center's Personnel account to cover the costs of a security scanner that was installed after the end of FY23.

Identify any projects, purchases, programs, contracts, or other obligations that will be deferred, delayed, or canceled as a result of the reduction in available spending authority that will result in the account that funds are transferred from.

None.

If the answer to the above question is “none” then please explain why this account was originally budgeted in a manner that caused an unobligated surplus to develop at this point in the fiscal year.

Cost of food increases due to inflation, and return to full activity post-COVID for juror services. JTDC scanner was to be paid for in FY23, however, it was not installed until after the end of FY 23, and after the FY 24 budget had been adopted.